

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 15, 21, 35 and 41 are amended.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Huffman in the January 31, 2006 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

In section 1 on page 2, the Office Action objects to the specification. The disclosure is amended as suggested by the Office Action. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification detailed in paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Office Action be withdrawn. Examiner Huffman is thanked for agreeing during the interview that the amendment to the specification overcomes the objection to the specification.

In section 2 on page 2, the Office Action objects to claims 1-40 for the specified informalities. Claims 1, 15, 21 and 35 are amended exactly as suggested by the Office Action. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the claims specified in section 2 on page 2 of the Office Action be withdrawn. Claim 41 is also amended accordingly. Examiner Huffman is thanked for agreeing that the amendments to claims 1, 15, 21 and 35 overcome the objections to claims 1-40. Examiner Huffman is also thanked for memorializing this agreement in the Interview Summary.

In section 4, on pages 2-4, the Office Action rejects claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 41 is amended to recite, "a method for printing a compensation pattern." The method comprises two steps of printing according to the claimed combination. Thus, claim 41 is not directed towards printed matter but to a method of printing. In other words, the basis for the rejection specified in the Office Action is no longer applicable to claim 41. It is respectfully submitted that claim 41 recites statutory subject matter. For at least the foregoing reasons, it

is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

Examiner Huffman is thanked for agreeing during the interview that the amendment to claim 41 overcomes the rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Examiner Huffman is also thanked for memorializing this agreement in the Interview Summary.

In section 6, on pages 4-5, the Office Action rejects claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,819,352 to Mizes et al. (hereinafter "Mizes"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 41 recites, "a first row of fiducial marks located before the plurality of gray level portions along the process direction, a second row of fiducial marks located after the plurality of gray level portions along the process direction, and at least one third row of fiducial marks, each third row of fiducial marks located in a gap between a pair of adjacent gray level portions." Claim 41 also recites, "at least one pair of fiducial marks in each row being separated by a whitespace." Thus, the gray level portions disclosed in Mizes cannot be interpreted as the rows of fiducial marks recited in claim 41.

With respect to the above-quoted subject matter, the Office Action relies on Fig. 2 of Mizes. Fig. 2 of Mizes discloses a plurality of gray level portions 21 and a plurality of rows of fiducial marks 20. However, all of the fiducial marks 20 disclosed in Mizes are to one side of all of the gray level portions 21. See Fig. 2. Thus, the fiducial marks 20 disclosed in Mizes do not have the orientation with respect to the gray level portions 21 disclosed in Mizes according to the above-quoted subject matter recited in claim 41. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Mizes does not disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter according to the combination recited in claim 41, particularly the subject matter from claim 41 quoted above.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 41 as being anticipated by Mizes be withdrawn. Examiner Huffman is thanked for agreeing during the interview that the amendment to claim 41 overcomes this rejection. Examiner Huffman is also thanked for memorializing that agreement in the Interview Summary.

In section 7 on pages 5-7, the Office Action indicates that claims 1-40 would be allowed if rewritten to overcome the objection outlined in section 2. Claims 1-40 are rewritten to overcome the objection outlined in section 2 as stated above in connection with the objection in section 2. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-40 should be allowed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-41 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Mark R. Woodall
Registration No. 43,286

JAO:MRW/rcc

Date: February 2, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--